City of Newport Beach 3300 Newport Boulevard - P.O. Box 1768 Newport Beach, CA 92658-8915 (949) 644-3200

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

To:

xx

Office of Planning and Research 1400 Tenth Street, Room 121 Sacramento, CA 95814

XX

County Clerk, County of Orange Public Services Division P.O. Box 238 Santa Ana, CA 92702 From:

City of Newport Beach Planning Department

3300 Newport Boulevard - P.O. Box 1768

Newport Beach, CA 92658-8915

(Orange County)

Date received for filing at OPR/County Clerk

Public Review Period: July 19 to August 18, 2003

Name of Project:	EMERSON ANNEXATION – Project PA 2003-149: General Plan Amendment GP 2003-006 and Code Amendment CA 2003-007				
Project Location:	Emerson Street, east of Tustin Avenue and south of 21 st Street/Holiday Road (see map at end of document)				
Project Description:	General plan amendment, prezoning, and annexation of the Emerson Street area to the City of Newport Beach				
Finding:	Pursuant to the provisions of City Council Policy K-3 pertaining to procedures and guidelines to implement the California Environmental Quality Act, the City has evaluated the proposed project and determined that it would not have a significant effect on the environment.				

A copy of the Initial Study containing the analysis supporting this finding is attached and is also on file at the Planning Department. The Initial Study may include mitigation measures that would eliminate or reduce potential environmental impacts. This document will be considered by the decision-makers prior to final action on the proposed project.

Additional plans, studies and/or exhibits relating to the proposed project may be available for public review. If you would like to examine these materials, you are invited to contact the undersigned. If you wish to appeal the appropriateness or adequacy of this document, your comments should be submitted in writing prior to the close of the public review period. Your comments should specifically identify what environmental impacts you believe would result from the project, why they are significant, and what changes or mitigation measures you believe should be adopted to eliminate or reduce these impacts. There is no fee for this appeal. If a public hearing will be held, you are also invited to attend and testify as to the appropriateness of this document. If you have any questions or would like further information, please contact Larry Lawrence, project manager for the City, at 949-661-8175.

Patricia L. Temple, Planning Director Date: July 10, 2003

CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH

INITIAL STUDY AND ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

1. Project Title: Project PA 2003-149, including General Plan

Amendment GP 2003-006 and Code Amendment CA 2003-007: General Plan Amendment, Prezoning, and Annexation of Emerson Street area (see map at end of

document)

2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Newport Beach

Planning Department 3300 Newport Boulevard

Newport Beach, CA 92658-8915

3. Contact Person and Phone No.: Larry Lawrence, Project Manager for City,

Lawrence Associates

949-661-8175

4. Project Location: Emerson Street, east of Tustin Avenue and south of 21st

Street/Holiday Road (see map at end of document))

5. Project Sponsor's Name/Address: City of Newport Beach

3300 Newport Boulevard

Newport Beach, CA 92658-8915

6. General Plan Designations: Low density residential under County of Orange

7. Zoning: Single family residential, under County of Orange

8. Description of Project: General plan amendment, prezoning, and annexation of

approximately 1.9 acres. Prior to review of the annexation by the Local Agency Formation Commission, the City of Newport Beach intends to process a general plan amendment and a zoning amendment in order to

prezone the area.

9. Surrounding Land Uses And Setting (see map at end of document):

Project Area:	Single family residential
To the west, south and east:	Residential uses in the City of Costa Mesa
To the north:	Residential uses in the City of Newport Beach

10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

Orange County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) and County of Orange.

11. Existing Conditions:

Land Use And Development

With the exception of a few vacant infill lots, the annexation area is built out. Current land uses in the area include single family homes.

The General Plan and Zoning Code maps for the City of Newport Beach do not cover the proposed annexation area. Therefore, land use and circulation designations must be adopted by the City in conjunction with annexation. Thus, general plan and prezoning amendments are part of the present annexation package.

Public Services

Public safety and other services for the annexation area are currently provided by the County of Orange, the Orange County Sheriff's Department, and the Orange County Fire Authority.

Utilities and Service Systems

Sewage collection is provided by the Costa Mesa Sanitary District while sewage treatment is provided by the Orange County Sanitation Districts. Water facilities and service are provided by the Mesa Consolidated Water District. Solid waste is collected by Waste Management Inc.

12. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

Aesthetics	☐ Geology/Soils	☐ Noise
Agricultural Resources	☐ Hazards/Hazardous Materials	☐ Population/Housing
Air Quality	☐ Hydrology/Water Quality	☐ Public Services
Biological Resources	☐ Land Use/Planning	☐ Recreation
Cultural Resources	☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Transportation/Traffic
Utilities & Service Systems	☐ Mandatory Findings of Signification	ance

No potentially significant impacts were found in any of the above areas. "No Impact" and "No Significant Impact" responses were given in all categories because the change in jurisdiction from the County of Orange to the City of Newport Beach will not result in any significant environmental effect. Any impacts in the areas of public services and utilities, such as police, fire, water, and sewer, will be less than significant. Also, any impacts on air quality, biological resources, water quality, or other environmental categories are the result of existing development, which will not change as a result of the change in jurisdiction.

13.	Determination. (To be completed by the Lead Agency.) On the basis of this initial	evaluation:			
	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	✓			
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.				
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.				
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.				
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.				
Sign Lar	July 10, 2003 Date Try Lawrence				

Printed Name

SECTIONS:

A. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

B. EXPLANATION OF CHECKLIST RESPONSES

A. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

The Environmental Checklist provides a preliminary analysis of the proposed project's potential for significant environmental impacts. Sources of information for all responses are specified immediately following the checklist.

The Initial Study indicates that the project may result in significant environmental impacts but that those impacts will be reduced to a less-than-significant level through the implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Study.

	IMPACT CATEGORY	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact	SOURCES*
i. A	ESTHETICS.	* S	ee Source Refer	ences at the e	nd of this Ch	ecklist.
	Would the project:					
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				\square	1,3,4
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				Ø	1,3,4
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?					1,3,4,5,6
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				Ø	1,3,4,5,6
II. <i>A</i>	AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. Would the project:					
а)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				Ø	1,3,4
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?					1,3,4,5,6

	IMPACT CATEGORY	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact	SOURCES*
		* Se	ee Source Refe	rences at the e	nd of this Ch	ecklist.
c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				☑	1,3,4,5,6
III.	AIR QUALITY. Would the project:					
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?					1,3,4,9,10
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?				Ø	1,3,4,9,10
c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?					1,3,4,9,10
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				Ø	1,3,4,9,10
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?					1,3,4,9,10
IV.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:					
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Dept. of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				☑	1,3,4
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				☑	1,3,4

	IMPACT CATEGORY	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact	SOURCES*
		* S	ee Source Refei	ences at the e	nd of this Ch	ecklist.
с)	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?		\(\)	, □	. ☑	1,3,4
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impeded the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				Ø	1,3,4
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				Ø	1,3,4
f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				☑	1,3,4
V. (CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:					
а)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				Ø	1,3,4
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				Ø	1,3,4
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				Ø	1,3,4
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				Ø	1,3,4

	IMPACT CATEGORY	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact	SOURCES*
		* Se	ee Source Refe	rences at the e	nd of this Ch	ecklist.
VI.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:					
a)	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special				Ø	1,3,4
	Publication 42. ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?					1,3,4
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?					1,3,4
	iv) Landslides?				\square	1,3,4,7
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?					1,3,4,7
c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				. 	1,3,4,7
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18- 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				Ø	1,3,4
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				Ø	n/a
VII.	HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:					
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				Ø	2,3,4,5,6
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				Ø	2,3,4,5,6

	IMPACT CATEGORY	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact	SOURCES*
		* S	ee Source Refe	rences at the e	nd of this Ch	ecklist.
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				Ø	2,3,4,5,6
d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites which complied pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				Ø	2,3,4,5,6
e)	For a project within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				Ø	2,3,4,5,6
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				Ø	n/a
g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				Ø	2,3,4,5,6
h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				Ø	2,3,4,5,6
VIII.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:					
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				☑	3,4

	IMPACT CATEGORY	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact	SOURCES*
b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	* Se	ee Source Refe	rences at the e	nd of this Ch	ескііst. 3,4
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				Ø	3,4
d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of a course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off-site?				Ø	3,4
e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				Ø	3,4
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				Ø	3,4
g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				☑	3,4
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				☑	3,4
i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				Ø	3,4
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?					3,4

	IMPACT CATEGORY	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact	SOURCES*
		* S	ee Source Refe	rences at the e	nd of this Ch	ecklist.
IX.	LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:					
a)	Physically divide an established community?				\square	1,2,3,4,5,6
b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			✓		1,2,3,4,5,6
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				Ø	1,2,3,4,5,6
X.	MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:					
a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				Ø	1,3,4
b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally- important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				☑	1,3,4
XI.	NOISE. Would the project result in:					
a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				☑	1,2,3,4,8
b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				Ø	1,2,3,4,8
c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			<u> </u>	Ø	1,2,3,4,8
d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				Ø	1,2,3,4,8

	IMPACT CATEGORY	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact	SOURCES*
		* Se	ee Source Refe	rences at the e	nd of this Ch	ecklist.
e)	For a project located within an airport land use land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				Ø	1,2,3,4,8
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				Ø	n/a
XII.	POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:					
a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				团	2,3,4
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				Ø	2,3,4
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				☑	2,3,4
XIII.	PUBLIC SERVICES Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:					
	Fire protection?			\square		2,3,4
	Police protection?			\square		2,3,4
	Parks?				$\overline{\square}$	2,3,4
	Schools?				\square	2,3,4
	Other public facilities?			<u> </u>		2,3,4

	IMPACT CATEGORY	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact	SOURCES*		
		* See Source References at the end of this Checklist.						
XIV.	RECREATION							
a)	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				Ø	2,3,4,6		
b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction of or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?		. 🗆		✓	1,2,3,4,6		
XV.	TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project:							
a)	Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				Ø	2,3,4,6		
b)	Exceed either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				Ø	2,3,4,6		
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				Ø	2,3,4,6		
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				☑	2,3,4,6		
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?				\square	2,3,4,6		
f)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?					2,3,4,5,6		
g)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bike racks)?				Ø	2,3,4,6		

	IMPACT CATEGORY	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact	SOURCES*
		* S	ee Source Refer	ences at the e	nd of this Ch	ecklist.
XVI.	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project:					
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				Ø	2,3,4,6
b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				Ø	2,3,4,6
c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				Ø	2,3,4,6
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				Ø	2,3,4,6
e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				Ø	2,3,4,6
f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				Ø	2,3,4,6
g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulation related to solid waste?	. 🗖			Ø	2,3,4,6

	IMPACT CATEGORY	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact	SOURCES*	
		* See Source References at the end of this Checklist.					
XVI	I. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.						
а)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of a major period of California history or prehistory?				Ø	1-10	
b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)				Ø	1-10	
c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				Ø	1-10	

XVIII. EARLIER ANALYSES.

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (CEQA Guidelines Section 15063). For the present annexation project, no significant impacts have been identified. All earlier analyses are listed under *Source References*, below.

XIX. SOURCE REFERENCES.

Documents listed below are available at the offices of the City of Newport Beach, Planning Department, 3300 Newport Boulevard, Newport Beach, California 92660 (Note: Reference No. 1 denotes a physical inspection and therefore is not in the form of a written document).

- 1. Site visits to annexation area by Larry Lawrence, project manager for City of Newport.
- 2. Report to Local Agency Formation Commission re Annexation Applications by Newport Beach and Costa Mesaof Area 7, by Dana Smith, LAFCO Executive Officer, September 16, 2002.
- 3. Final Program EIR City of Newport Beach General Plan.
- 4. General Plan, including all Elements, City of Newport Beach.
- Zoning Code, Title 20 of the Newport Beach Municipal Code.
- 6. Zoning Code and Districting Maps, County of Orange.
- 7. City Excavation and Grading Code, Newport Beach Municipal Code.
- 8. Community Noise Ordinance, Chapter 10.28 of the Newport Beach Municipal Code.
- 9. Air Quality Management Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District, 1997.
- 10. Air Quality Management Plan EIR, South Coast Air Quality Management District, 1997.

B. EXPLANATION OF CHECKLIST RESPONSES:

In all cases, the selection of the Checklist response was the product of the data sources listed above, followed by careful consideration of potential impacts from the project under the definitions and procedures of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statute and Guidelines.

No potentially significant impacts were found. "No Impact" and "No Significant Impact" responses were given in all categories because the change in jurisdiction from the County of Orange to the City of Newport Beach will not result in any environmental effect. Any impacts on air quality, biological resources, water quality, or other categories are the result of existing development, which will not change as a result of the change in jurisdiction.

Notwithstanding the lack of significant impact found, the following sections contain further explanations of responses in the salient areas of Land Use and Planning, Public Services, and Utilities and Service Systems.

• LAND USE AND PLANNING:

The proposed annexation area is not included on the City of Newport Beach General Plan and Zoning Maps. Therefore, general plan and prezoning actions by the City of Newport Beach have been made part of the present annexation project (see page 1 of this Initial Study). The intent of these applications is to retain comparable land use and zoning regulations as those presently in effect under the County. Thus, in terms of land use and planning, the net result of the annexation will be a less-than-significant environmental impact.

• PUBLIC SERVICES:

- 1. <u>Fire and Police</u> Fire protection services will transfer from the Orange County Fire Authority to the Newport Beach Fire and Marine Department and police services will transfer from the Orange County Sheriff to the Newport Beach Police Department. The existing levels of service for both fire and police protection will be maintained or improved because of the closer proximity of City offices and facilities than is now the case under County jurisdiction.
- 2. Other Services Other public services and facilities, such as administrative, recreation, code enforcement, planning, public works and others will remain unchanged or possibly improve because of the closer proximity of City offices and facilities than is now the case.

From the above information, the net effect on public services from the annexation will be a less-than-significant impact.

• <u>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</u>:

Utility systems are already in place for this built-out area. Water facilities and service are provided by the Mesa Consolidated Water District. Sewage collection is provided by the Costa Mesa Sanitary District. Sewage treatment is provided by the Orange County Sanitation Districts. Solid waste is collected by a private firm, Waste Management Inc.

It is intended that these facilities and services remain with the current providers after annexation. Thus, there will be no impact on water, sewer, wastewater treatment, solid waste disposal, or other utility systems as a result of the annexation, and service will continue uninterrupted. The net effect on utilities and service systems from the annexation will be a less-than-significant impact.

MAP OF ANNEXATION AREA

